

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>SAMUEL MARRERO,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:19-CV-265</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff</b>	:	<b>(Chief Judge Conner)</b>
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>COLLEEN BURDEN,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendant</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 28th day of March, 2019, upon consideration of the report (Doc. 6) of Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson, recommending that the court dismiss the complaint (Doc. 1) of *pro se* plaintiff Samuel Marrero (“Marrero”) for failure to state a claim for which relief may be granted pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), and it appearing that Marrero has not objected to the report, see FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(2), and the court noting that failure of a party to timely object to a magistrate judge’s conclusions “may result in forfeiture of *de novo* review at the district court level,” Nara v. Frank, 488 F.3d 187, 194 (3d Cir. 2007) (citing Henderson v. Carlson, 812 F.2d 874, 878-79 (3d Cir. 1987)), but that, as a matter of good practice, a district court should afford “reasoned consideration” to the uncontested portions of the report, E.E.O.C. v. City of Long Branch, 866 F.3d 93, 100 (3d Cir. 2017) (quoting Henderson, 812 F.2d at 879), in order to “satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record,” FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes, and following independent review of the record, the court being in

agreement with Judge Carlson's recommendation, and concluding that there is no clear error on the face of the record, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. The report (Doc. 6) of Magistrate Judge Carlson is ADOPTED.
2. Marrero's complaint (Doc. 1) is DISMISSED without prejudice.
3. The Clerk of Court is directed to CLOSE this case.
4. Any appeal from this order is deemed to be frivolous and not taken in good faith. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3).

/S/ CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
Christopher C. Conner, Chief Judge  
United States District Court  
Middle District of Pennsylvania